

## REMARKS

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ung et al. (6,694,000) in view of Joyce et al. (6,381,316) cited on the Ung patent.

Claims 6-12 have been added to the case.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Turning first to a discussion of Ung, the patent discloses a method for storing electronic account information for access over the Internet in conjunction with a prepaid account (e.g., col. 2, lines 42-47). Applicants' reading Ung leads them to believe that the only charges made to the prepaid account are through telephone calls; access to the "Web Gateway application" to view the call detail record (CDR) of the account does not incur a charge. As a result, Ung does not teach the step in claim 1 of "decrementing the prepaid account (responsive to the step of serving the electronic communication to the remote computer). Furthermore, Ung does not discuss access to facsimiles or voice mails.

The Joyce patent discloses using a prepaid account to access from a telephone many different types of telephone services such as voice mail, call forwarding, or call conferencing. The Joyce patent does not anticipate Internet access from a computer since all communications from a customer is originated from a wireline or wireless telephone (col. 7, lines 63-67). It is clear that services occur through telephone prompts and that it would be impossible to "present a list" of either voice mails or facsimiles for service to the remote computer as required in your present claims 2 and 3.

The Examiner states in the outstanding office action that Joyce provides "visual access to subscriber." (page 4) Applicants respectfully disagree. Joyce teaches only that the system manager (and not the subscriber) has access through a computer to prepaid account information. This is only in service to the user and no charge is decremented from the user account from this access. (col. 20, lines 25-50) Accordingly, the Examiner is incorrect in his assertion that Joyce provides "visual access to subscriber." (page 4) Accordingly, the services asserted, particularly in claims 2 and 3, are not taught by Ung or Joyce alone or in combination. And while the word "facsimile" is mentioned cryptically within Joyce, it is unclear from the disclosure how such services can be accessed from customer telephones – either by receipt or transmission. The word Facsimile is only used three times in the entire application and two of those times are in reference to how rate information can be transmitted to a customer. The remaining reference to facsimile (col. 20, line 45) only refers to a

"service" and not how that service is provided. Accordingly, no weight should be giving to that aspect of the prior art in teaching the claimed limitations.


Claims 6-12 recite the invention with new features, particularly those implicated by blocks 74 and 92 within the specification. Allowance is respectfully requested.

#### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and allowance of original claims 1-5 and new claims 6-12 of the application as amended is solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.



Scott A. Schaffer  
Reg. No. 38,610

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
1030 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205  
503-222-3613  
Customer No. 20575